Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting September 11, 2012, Room 317 City Hall

Date of Z&P Meeting: December 4, 2012

ITEM SUMMARY

Description Item #3, BZH #27416

413-425 Main Street Southeast, St. Anthony Falls Historic District

Kelly Doran with Doran Development LLC, submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness

application to allow for a new apartment building at 413-425 Main Street Southeast, Phase II Mill

& Main project, located within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

Action Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the item was continued two cycles to the Tuesday,

October 23, 2012, Heritage Preservation Commission meeting.

Roll Call Vote Aye: Faucher, Hunter Weir, Lackovic, Larsen, Lindberg, R. Mack

Absent: Haecker, L. Mack, Tableporter

Motion Passed

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, Mill & Main Phase II is Item #3, 413-25 Main Street Southeast. The new apartment building is proposed for the annex and Warehouse III site, 413-425 Main Street. Those buildings, as you know, non-contributing the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, were approved for demolition on March 20. The new proposal for the site is a new seven-story apartment building: the first two floors being parking and liner apartments; floors 3 and 4, the residence above. Similar to Phase I, 190 units, U-shaped design, and they break up the massing with five different sections of variated materials. The siting of the project was approved at the August 7 HPC meeting and being in compliance with the joint site plan. The project retains the two Great Northern Railway Spur Corridors serving the A-Mill Complex, and in addition they are proposing a 4th Avenue connection with interpretive panels. And I can talk more about that and focus on that in a bit.

The design of the project, as I mentioned, is broken up into those five envelopes. Starting from Main Street I can give a brief summary of each envelope. Starting at Main Street and 5th Avenue elevation there is the plum colored brick veneer with partially recessed balconies.

Chair Larsen: Do you want to put up the different brick samples?

Hanauer: Yes ...

Chair Larsen: Even you can maybe lean them up in front, so as we talk about the different materials we'll be able to see them in context with each other.

Hanauer: I know the color, what you see, is a little off ... ok ... alright, I think we will have to work with this and then ...

Chair Larsen: We do have our color renderings and so I think this should work.

Hanauer: Ok, Envelope 2, considering the middle portion of the building facing Main Street, you have that two story stone veneer.

Chair Larsen: Have you identified Envelope 1?

Hanauer: Envelope 1 being the plum colored brick building on 5th Avenue.

Chair Larsen: Ok

Hanauer: Envelope 2, that two-story building, portion building fronting Main Street. It is setback 5-feet from Envelope 1 and above there you have the terrace and behind that approximately 68 feet the building rises 5 stories with a buck colored metal on the top 4 floors and a hardiboard, a dark hardiboard, on top. So you would have ...

Lindberg: Like the top penthouse floor, or are you referring to all of the dark that we are seeing basically ...

Hanauer: That top floor. And then this treatment of the vertical rib panel and the dark Hardy board on top is carried forward on the Prince Street elevation. Envelope 3 which provides the main entrance to the building and extends five feet in front of the adjacent envelopes, has the buff colored brick, the primary entrance as I mentioned, and two signs: one a wall sign at the top of the building (I'll talk about that more in a bit), and it also has the approximately 5-foot high, to here, parapet that you'll see in some renderings that you can see more. But it is not extended for the entire depth of the building, just a short ...

Chair Larsen: Kind of a return?

Hanauer: Correct. And I have an image of the projecting sign that I believe is in one of the renderings in your packet. Moving on, Envelope 4, closest, this is the portion of the building closest to the A-Mill historic buildings, the historic buildings of the A-Mill complex. They are two-story gray masonry base along Main Street and then the upper floors 3-7 have that plum colored brick again. In this elevation, as I talk about my conditions of approval, I want to bring to your attention the louvers, the magic packs. The windows that you see on this elevation, they show up as dark or black windows but the applicant is proposing to have white windows, but the 8 light horizontal windows, based on a conversation with the architect, it was given the darkness of the lines, it appears as dark windows but they are actually white windows. There is some renderings that were provided, I believe, in the addendum packet today.

Chair Larsen: And then, Aaron, is that stone then, that's over here, the white stone, is that the base material then?

Hanauer: Chair, that is correct. Along Main Street.

Lindberg: And then where is the gray brick that you referred to? Is that, the applicant said those were backup, didn't he?

Chair Larsen: So the ...

Hanauer: The ones right here, this was an alternative to the plum brick.

Lindberg: But then where is the gray brick that you referred to?

Chair Larsen: He didn't ... he said stone. So the base is the stone on Envelope 4, and then the plum, the darker brick on the podium, is the above material. Does that make sense?

Lindberg: Yeah, but it almost shows as two different materials in the renderings, like one is brick and one is stone. Never mind, I got it.

Hanauer: Ok, the balconies for Envelope 4 shows the full projecting balconies. The last portion of the building I wanted to bring to your attention, well, before I get to that those treatments that you see on Main Street are carried over to the Prince Street elevation. Here is the back of Envelope 3, here is the back of Envelope 2, and then finally I want to talk about the last portion, we are now getting to the 5th Avenue elevation again. Envelope 5, another buff colored brick with dark hardiboard on top. The 5th Avenue elevation, continue that buff colored brick and then dark hardiboard panels carried downward for two of the bays.

As I mentioned, there is two signs for the building. One, the wall sign that is located on top of the parapet. Seven feet high, the lettering. It is 85 feet above grade. When just drawing a square around the letters, you have a 90 square foot sign. Also, on this Envelope 3 there is a projecting sign. Both of them say Mill & Main. This one the projecting sign is 38 square feet. It rises to the top of the sign being 32 feet above grade. Both of the signs are a combination of internally and externally illuminated. The mill portion of the sign being internally illuminated and the main portion of the sign being externally illuminated. I think the applicant can talk more about questions of how the externally illuminated sign is going to happen. It is more of a glowing, in talking with the architect it was more of a glow for the main portion of the sign.

When reviewing this project, CPED found that based on the findings, that overall the project is in compliance with the guidelines and is a positive to the district. It will assist with the rehabilitation of the A-Mill, relates to the historic buildings, protects the Great Northern Railway Corridor, supports a number of Comprehensive Plan policies for housing, Heritage Preservation, and urban design, and is in compliance with the Marcy Holmes plan. There are five, there are conditions of approval though and a few aspects of the project that we wanted to talk about in more detail. On page 19 are the conditions of approval. I wanted to focus the additional discussion on condition four of the louvers or the magic packs near the A-Mill, the proposed A-Mill sign at the top of the building, the balconies, the fully projecting balconies on Envelope 4, the window material ... actually just the window color of those windows on Envelope 4, and then the overall height of the building, that being condition 9. In talking with the applicant, condition 8 was "all windows shall be true divided lights or have an interstitial spacer; snap-in mullions are not approved." In talking with the applicant, this is something that they are not proposing to do so they are fine with that condition of approval.

Moving to the, for these findings ... in talking about the sign first, for condition of approval number 5 CPED is recommending that the proposed mill & main sign is not approved. We feel that the sign is, given its location and the height of the sign, that it will take away from the A-Mill sign that is nearby and that the size and location will draw too much attention away from that and detract from the district. The maximum height of the sign is, by the guidelines, is supposed to be 14 feet. The sign is proposed to be 85 feet in height, as I mentioned. And the size, what the guidelines allow for a wall sign is 32 square feet, the sign is 90. The sign dimensions, the letters are supposed to be maximum 2 feet in height, what is proposed is 7 feet.

For Envelope 4, moving on to condition number 4, the exposed HVAC/louvers are allowed on the outside walls for the building with the exception of envelope 4 facing Main Street and the elevation facing the A-Mill building. We felt that with the guidelines, the St. Anthony Falls Guidelines call out that general infill construction shall be visually compatible with the historic structures within the sub-area with regard to the materials and that the exterior surface of the new material shall be constructed of brick, stone, and concrete. By not allowing for the magic packs so close to the A-Mill buildings, we felt that the entire building would be able to relate better to the historic buildings nearby. CPED did not feel that the grills are visually compatible or consistent with the historic structures within the sub-area. Historically building openings on exterior walls were those windows or doors and we feel that the applicant has other options besides the grills at this location. In putting up an interior wall, if inset balconies were proposed, a split system for mechanical or a centralized system.

The balconies for Envelope 4, the fully projecting balconies, CPED is recommending that the balconies shall be partially recessed and shall not extend more than 2 feet from the outer wall. The St. Anthony Falls Guidelines call out that for sub-district H, which this is the area of, currently, there shall be no major projection on the principal façade and for the general guidelines balconies were not a part of most historic buildings in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

With CPED's recommendation and in the report it stated that replacing the projecting balconies with partially recessed balconies will allow for the building to have the shadow lines, for the balconies not to project forward of the A-Mill building, and to reinforce the concept of a simple rectangular form of the building.

Two more conditions of approval, the window color, the proposed white is something that we feel is not in compliance with the district guidelines. The guidelines calling out infill construction shall be visually compatible with the historic structures with regard to material and that trim should be subdued earth tone or black. The white material, we did not see that being similar to the neighboring buildings and that the white would likely draw too much attention to that portion of the building rather than the historic buildings.

And finally condition of approval 9, the height of the building shall be one story lower on the outer envelopes. That being the red brick portions of the building and that all stories be true stories, not that partial top half or just a small portion of the building. The current guidelines, the general guideline for the district is that infill construction shall be visually compatible with historic structures within the sub-area with regards to height. By having the proposed building be one story smaller on the outside portions of the building, we feel that will better relate to the A-Mill complex buildings which have varied heights along Main Street. And it also provides some relief given that both Phase I and Phase II are at similar heights, or over 780 linear feet by combining the two. That same height, that seven story height, does not feel consistent with the varied heights of the A-Mill complex. We state in the report that it detracts from the complex and if the height ... also, in addition to the findings for the district, we feel that throughout the findings in the report that it is not consistent. The district and the A-Mill complex's significance for its architecture and the varied height, and by having one of the most distinctive skyscapes in Minneapolis, currently with the A-Mill project, by introducing that same height for that length of two city blocks, it will detract from the district and from the A-Mill itself.

I'd be happy to answer ... I wanted to draw your attention again to the Marcy Holmes neighborhood who did submit a letter supporting the Phase II concept. This letter was from June 25. But I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Larsen: I have got one, but I'm sure others will have some as well. If you can take me back, briefly, I know we've had a discussion and I think this was at the business meeting regarding windows on Phase I and they were interested in changing the color of the windows on that building, that phase, as well. And if you could remind me where that stands at the moment.

Hanauer: Chair Larsen, the windows on Phase I, the color of the windows, this was something that was similar to what was shown in the drawings for Phase II in that what was shown as white and what, they did have some windows that were proposed to be white, those were in the line drawings with the colored renderings, they appeared to be that dark window. So it was brought to my attention that what was shown to the commission and what was shown to staff were the white windows, but I went by what I could see in the colored renderings and did not look at the called out materials and so there was not a proposed change in color for windows in Phase I.

Chair Larsen: Which means what?

Hanauer: Which means that the windows that are going in that were shown in the drawings as white are going to be white for Phase I.

Chair Larsen: And ... they're shaking their head back there. I know there also have been I think a design change, a structural ... we'll address that, I'll ask that of the applicant and give them a chance to weigh in. I just wanted us to weigh that as we consider Phase II and how that might play in from one to the other or both. Alright, questions of staff at this time? Ok, Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: Refresh my memory, I think the recessed balconies or the projecting balconies facing Main Street and the louvers that have come up in the past, several times I think, but was there not a variation on the theme that those were corrected at one point, or am I making that up?

Hanauer: Corrected?

Lackovic: Or just, I thought there was a version at one point that actually pulled the balconies back and resolved the issues with the louvers on the Main Street side.

Chair Larsen: That might have been Phase I.

Hanauer: In Phase I, and in parts of Phase II, you have portions of the building that do have the recessed balconies and the magic packs on the inside wall of the balcony.

Chair Larsen: So Envelope 3 and 1 have that, they are just proposing to put them on the facing face. Ok, anybody else at this time? Ok, I'm sure we will have some more later on as we go. But we'll open up the public hearing.

Aaron Roseth: Good afternoon Chair and commissioners, my name is Aaron Roseth and I'm with ESG Architects at 500 Washington Avenue and I am here on behalf of this project representing the architectural end. Trace Jacques is here as well, who you've heard from in the past and he and myself are available for questions throughout regarding Phase I, Phase II, or any specific questions. Kelly Doran and Ann Berandt are also here from Doran Construction, or Doran Companies, and Kelly will be speaking as well.

So I have a few opening remarks. Over the past several years the team before you has been working very, very diligently toward an appropriate architectural project for this entire area. We have attempted to embody in our two buildings along Main Street, the St. Anthony Falls Historic guidelines and Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties as well as public commentary, city opinions and recommendations through countless meetings, neighborhood meetings, discussions and input with Dominium, BKV, CPED, the HPC, neighborhood groups, stakeholders, and many, many others. We truly proudly stand here before you with a meaningful and, we believe, historically significant addition to the St. Anthony Historic District. We have discussed the staff letter of recommendation in detail with our team. This afternoon, Kelly Doran and myself will communicate to you our reaction to the City of Minneapolis staff recommendation for approval of this project. We have specific requests to modify a few of the conditions of approval. Instead of giving a full recap of the architecture, urban design impact, and historically sensitive design decisions that we've made throughout this process, we'd like to talk very specifically and directly about a few specific conditions of approval that have been suggested which will dramatically affect the possibility of this project moving forward. Our point of view request, that you consider an alternative perspective that still maintains your responsibility of new construction projects that need to follow the St. Anthony Falls Historic District guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. Kelly Doran will clarify the specific items that we are requesting that you do not include as conditions of approval. I'm going to present a few details to a few of these conditions that will hopefully communicate our approach, our design sensitivity and interpretations of the guidelines before you.

Regarding item 4, the exposed HVAC louvers and grills, we believe we have taken great care of integrating exterior mechanical louvers throughout all of the elevations that are integral to our design. It is integral to the design, it is integral to the massing and the overall expression of our facades and the composition of the way that we have arranged things. I am going to show a few slides here, these are renderings and a previous commissioner, Commissioner Mack who isn't with us tonight, asked specifically while we were talking about this with Phase I, how, in the renderings that we showed from Phase I, those get integrated. Each of the renderings that you each have a copy of before you integrates these, has the mechanical louvers represented truthfully in these renderings. In our opinion, we believe that carefully laid out grills are an appropriate expression of the building design and in the spirit of industrial buildings. And I'll try to explain why we believe that. The exterior grills, in our opinion, will enhance the elevations through punctured rhythms within each façade, create a composition of forms while maintaining an overall massing similar to industrial buildings that honestly express their utility and form. The alternative mechanical approach is cost prohibitive to this project. There is sincerely a several hundred thousand dollar difference between the proposed magic pack design and a house system that would require significant mechanical equipment that would either located on the roof or the ground. The building construction type that we have chosen, because of cost for this program, will not easily accommodate house mechanical units on the roof. In addition,

exposing large mechanical units on the ground would adversely affect the ground plane of this site in addition to the sound of these units for the residents of this project and the public domain overall. Here's one more image that I'd like you to look at, the vertical emphasis that has been broken up, for example in this buff colored building, the vertical stripe between the two windows on your left-hand side is where those mechanical grills are integrated. Now that doesn't take that entire extent of that building up in elevation, we believe through integrating this design and creating that almost as a stripe effect in that area, the adjacent materials are the same colors as the grill, and essentially disappear because it has been carefully composed.

So my conclusion to this is we strongly suggest that you modify this condition in order for this project to move forward. It is a very, very serious issue for us. One other illustration I wanted to show you is, this is a view literally looking from the apartment building that Dominium is doing in the Red Tile Elevator, the units in the Red Tile Elevator, as you know, don't start until you get above the silos, the circular silos below. So this is from the first elevation of apartments that are looking towards the roof. The alternative approaches to a mechanical system from having exposed louvers on the exterior are a field of condensing units, a boiler, and a split system, or an alternative is a big huge HVAC system that goes on top of here. We believe that carefully integrated exterior composition of HVAC is much better than these types of use, both seen from these apartments, and across the river, let alone the sound that those create for the public and the residents.

The next series of slides. I'm going to talk about item 6, balconies. The plum building being proposed along Main Street facing the A-Mill building, planned west elevation, has been expressed as probably the most industrially inspired facades of our entire project. Both vertically and horizontal, excuse me, both vertical and horizontal measures have been incorporated into the design. By recessing the entire building back from the adjacent facade, we have allowed the existing rail line along Main Street to remain in its location. We talked to you about this in the past. The rail line on the screen before you right now, at the point of the plum building right here, the rail starts to curve in towards the A-Mill. In a similar way on the backside it actually starts all the way back at the beginning of the property on 5th, it starts to cant in towards the A-Mill. And so the massing of the project has responded to that in order to allow for that exact existing location to remain in place. The exposed balconies reinforce, in our opinion, that stepping back of the façade. By not recessing them into the building, we believe it is a stronger statement of a pure façade being stepped back and then the balconies hung from the outside. The exposed balconies reinforce this stepping back of the facade. In addition, we believe that the balconies are meant for occupants to go outside. Other dwelling units are arguably more conducive when not recessed for full exposure to light, air, and views. Although a variety of what I call "innies" and "outie" balconies have been used in the composition of this project. In this instance, we believe that fully exposed balconies reinforce an honest expression of the function and are appropriate next to the A-Mill complex. Like historic elements such as fire escapes, appendages for utilitarian uses, smoke flues, conveyor systems, etc., that can be seen in warehouse districts and historical industrial districts and the A-Mill complex. In addition the proposed light weight industrial inspired hung balconies allow and reinforce the building to read as a solid massing consistent with historic massing.

The next item we'd like to talk about is the windows, item 7. I'm going to leave this image up. We believe that the white windows in the west plum building enhance the overall expression of the exterior composition. Light colored or white horizontal banding with vertical mullions and vertical emphasis through groupings of balconies and mechanical grills all together create a visually interesting façade and further differentiates itself from other façade compositions. The patterning of the façade hearkens back to industrial buildings. Two familiar examples in our city are the Ford Center and a highly contrasting one is also the Spaghetti Factory. You can see the highly contrasting materials between the horizontal and vertical bands on both of these buildings. Our windows, as Aaron mentioned, will be mulled together into true divided lights. Just a clarification on that item 8, it could be interpreted in the staff report that additional mullions would be suggested for other windows. We clarified with Aaron that that was not what they were suggesting. It is that the windows on the plum building would truly be mulled together, it would not be snapped on mullions. We intend to do it that way.

The last item, item 9, is probably the most ...

Chair Larsen: I hate to interrupt, but while we're on that can you address, just so when we're thinking about windows and color, can you address ...

Aaron Roseth: From Phase I?

Chair Larsen: Ok, Kelly want to talk about that, ok.

R. Mack: I'd like to ask a quick question too, is there any confusion between mullions and muntins in the terms that are being used here?

Aaron Roseth: That's a very good question. Our interpretation of the staff report was that it wouldn't be muntins intended as their commentary. It was specific to this plum building and it was mullions and true divided lights. That there wasn't a second layer of breaking up that glass.

R. Mack: I tend to think of mullions as having a structural purpose.

Aaron Roseth: And these would.

R. Mack: And so it couldn't have an inner piece anyway.

Aaron Roseth: Right. Last item, item 9. The Mill & Main Phase II design is shaped by a series of key urban design principals and guidelines. From a historic perspective, the design is shaped by the Marcy Holmes consensus statement of January of 2006. A key aspect of this design is shaping of a strong public ground of active streets and spaces that are arrived at through a strong collaboration within the A-Mill district. A key design principal that has been consistently used going back to the Schaffer Richardson proposal was the creation of a consistent mid-rise building height and cornice line or datum to establish a unified district fabric and scale. In the eventually approved Schaffer Richardson design there was always a mid-rise podium to the point towers that were significantly set back from that mid-rise podium. The height consistency can be seen in many historic warehouse areas within the Twin Cities and gives these warehouse districts their identities. When we think of the building technology that created warehouse districts, think about the load bearing masonry construction types that they were using. Most of them went as high as they absolutely could within that construction type. In many respects I think it is a really cool thing that is happening with the mill district that, in our construction type, this is our limits. And creating that datum, I think, hearkens back to what happened to the original warehouse districts when they were being developed. With respect to the staff opinion that the height of the building shall be one story lower on the outer building masses, we believe that this minor adjustment to the height actually decreases the emphasis towards the Red Tile Elevator and A Mill building complex. The massing and stepping back in both plan on the north and south side creates an open perspective view in key areas such as Prince Street. And so, we talked about this in the business meeting with you, the massing of this has been established similar to Phase I because of these reasons. We wanted to create a strong edge condition along Main Street and the recesses in the building, or the play of the masses, have been set up so that we can have unbelievable views such as this as you are walking down Prince Street. And it sets up (gap in tape due to turning) will require adding two additional stairs to accommodate the reduced top floor level. Beyond the actual metrics and density requirements to make this development happen, this will add cost and inefficiency to this building that will make it economically infeasible. Kelly Doran will speak now to the specifics of the items we are requesting you to remove as conditions of approval. I'm here for questions too, thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Kelly Doran: Thanks, Aaron. Mr. Chair, members of the commission, my name is Kelly Doran. I live at 404 River Street in Minneapolis. We are happy to be here to talk about this. We have a minor disagreement with staff over a few of these things and I'd like to talk just a little bit more, and add a little bit more to the conversation that Aaron has already laid out to you. I'm going to go a little bit out of order and I'm going to focus as well on conditions in the staff report 4-9. But I'd like to start with condition 5. I was not personally at the joint meeting of this commission and the planning commission, I was not able to attend that. But it was our understanding from that meeting that there was some discussion amongst the various parties at the meeting that I think at that time we had a sign at the building that said M&M and somebody said no, it sounds like candy and let's not do that. How about maybe making it Mill & Main and just to reinforce that the former 5th Street is now a private road and is going to be

called Mill Street. So just so you have that in your head. So somebody said, well let's make it a bigger sign, ok, so we took that lead and ran with it and we made it a bigger sign. If this were not, we're not hung up on that particular issue, on that particular issue. We think it adds to the project, we think it adds to the excitement of the area, and we think it will be a beacon and should be known from across the river, but if you as a commission are strongly opposed to that, well then we will abide by your view on that issue, but we think it should be there but we're not hung up on that particular issue. On the balconies on Envelope 4, number 6, we purposely wanted that part of the building to look differently. If you look, and there are several references throughout the staff report that this building is 378 feet long and it is 7 stories, and it infers to some extent that it is 7 stories for the whole 378 feet, and it is not. There is a middle part of this building that is about 130 feet that is only 2 stories where that part of the building is set back some 75 something feet from the Main Street. The building undulates in the front where we had to set back the building in Envelope 4 as it is called in the staff report. So we purposely took that tack to use it a different window style, to bring the balconies out, to make that building look different. We added the white color to carry on into item 7, we added the white color because we felt what is behind this building? We say that things don't work with the A-Mill building and the annex and the Red Tile building, but if you look at all of the photographs that are attached in your folders, what's behind it? A mass of white structure that is clearly visible from almost every perspective that you look at. I live on the river. I walk the river almost every day. I look at this site probably more in depth than anybody in this town. And I will tell you that it is very unlikely that you will see over the trees and over the other structures that are along the river anything but the top floors of this building, even as far as half way across the Stone Arch bridge you can barely see this building except for the upper portions of it. So when you get into a closer view of it, until you get literally past the park, you won't see that. And when you look at it from down the street and the perspective that it will lend, it does not look like one 7-story, 378-foot long building. And in fact it doesn't even take you very long to cross 3rd Street to look back and you can't see this building, because of the existing vegetation that is in the way. So there is very, very few view corridors where this building would be seen in any kind of context as a 378-foot long, 7-story uniform building. And I thought in the staff report there is a mention in that section about the yet-to-be-adopted guidelines. And when you kind of put this, at least in my perspective, in the context of what we are trying to accomplish here, you have the tallest part of the whole block the Red Tile building, 189 feet, we don't even get to the top of the round silos in terms of a 7-story building. And, again, to refresh everyone, the 7-story building we are talking about is the first two levels from the Main Street side, are two-level townhomes, direct entry townhomes, with a parking facility behind that, hidden behind the liner of those townhomes, and then 5 stories on top of the platform that would be above it. But I just thought that the perspective that is conveyed in the staff report, and I say this respectfully, is if you are looking at this building in a two-dimensional model, and there is no twodimensional model here. It is a three-dimensional deal and I think that's why these many renderings that we've done and Aaron has shared with you indicate how this building will actually interact with the street and with the surrounding area. But going back to what I was saying, on page 10 of the staff report, under the proposed guidelines section 9.13, and it says a block-long façade is inappropriate but then it goes on to say however, a block-long building will be considered if the facade reads as separate building modules. The following should be considered in the design to divide the composition in subcomponents as such that it reads as several discreet modules that are consistent with traditional building widths in the context. And I don't know how we could have done a better job at that, personally. If you look at it kind of dimensionally, if you look at the street frontage width of Envelopes 3 and 4, it is about 170 some feet. That's about the width of the A-Mill building. And if you look at the A-Mill building as you go east from that the building sets back. And that's what our building does. And then if you look at the Red Tile building, the width of the Red Tile building is not totally inconsistent with Envelope 1. And so we actually, I think, have done a pretty good job of mirroring what is there in the context of what's there, and created that same thing with the platform in between, not unlike the platform that is in the Annex building that they were landing helicopters on the other day. So I think that we just have a disagreement with staff on that aspect of the project. However, we're not going to fall on our swords over white windows. If you feel strongly that they shouldn't be white windows, then we can go back to the dark bronze type windows. And to answer your question from earlier, Mr. Chairman, about Phase I, there was post approval, some dialog with staff, about the possibility of the buff colored portion of the Phase I building using white windows. That was met with some resistance, so we just simply did not pursue that and those windows are kind of a tan, earth tone color and the other windows are kind of a dark bronze color. So there is two different colors of windows there. But not white.

Chair Larsen: And there was a change, a small change in the design of those windows due to structural ...

Kelly Doran: There was a downsizing of some of the windows, the width of some of the windows by like 4 inches here, 6 inches there, just from a structural standpoint. Because we had stretched the envelope to try to maximize as much glass in the building as we could.

Chair Larsen: So there are no white windows on Phase I?

Kelly Doran: No white windows on Phase I. So lastly I think we've debated condition 8. In summary real quick, we're not, we think the sign on number 5 would be appropriate, but we're not going to strenuously object to that if you disapprove of it. We think the balconies on Envelope 4 should be fully exposed. We think that adds to the building and the unique nature. We designed the window system on that building ... Aaron, how do I get that other elevation up here, looking back to the daylight elevation ... that one. We designed those windows to make them look a little more industrial. They're awning type openings, they'll have multiple openings on each of them so it kind of hearkens back to the awning type windows that were in many industrial buildings in the past. We are not hung up, I mean we'd like to have the white windows, we think it adds a distinct nature to that part of the building, particularly with the darker brick. I think going to a darker window is going to make it look a little monotone.

We talked about number 8, so that leads me back to number 4 and number 9, and I'll start with number 9. We're a bit perplexed about why that condition is being asked to do and we don't think that that adds anything to the project by reducing the height of those two portions of the building. We actually to the contrary think that it is a negative and detracts from the project. We don't think that it will read any differently in a long view from, if you are talking about this from a long view, downtown or the Stone Arch bridge, those views are so far away the human eye is not going to notice the difference between whether that building is 6 stories or 7 stories. And it is a material, absolutely credible loss to this project and jeopardizes its financial ability to perform. And I want to talk about that, because why are we even here? We haven't really talked about that. Why are we even here for Phase II yet, we haven't even finished Phase I. We're here for Phase II because Dominium, as you've spent many hours with Dominium and their proposed project, and they are anxious to move forward, and in order for their project to move forward some things like property lines and other things have to be moved and massaged in order to accomplish the part of the property being on, the property line being moved so all of the historic structures are on their property. Some of the historic structures, some of the property lines currently bisects some of the historic structures. We have to do it for building code purposes and fire code purposes, so we have to do all of this so I said well I think before we go too far down that road, let's all make sure we are on the same page. So that's why we came forward with this project, to make certain that we, Dominium, and the city, were on the same page. So that's why we are here, and so these are all issues that are connected to everyone understanding how we are moving forward.

On number 4, the exposed HVAC louvers, you know, if you said to me that the balconies on envelope 4 shouldn't be exposed and should be recessed, I'm sure there is a way we could put those louvers into the recessed balconies. Ok, I'm pretty comfortable that we could design it that way, however if you think that the balconies should be exposed then I would say that the louvers should be allowed. What we've done here is, these are not factory made louvers that come with a unit – these are custom designed and custom installed, integral to the building. We don't use in any of our projects, the manufacturer's supply grills. We have always used custom grills on all of our projects so if you tour any of the things that we've built including over at the university, you'll see that. And we think that these grills are architecturally integrated. They basically go the full height of the story, they're not some 2x3 foot grill that is there, and we think that it creates a rhythm of projection in the building that is appropriate for this industrial area. And it's not even precedence setting in nature. There are other buildings that have recently been approved in this same historic district that have grills and there are other buildings that are historic that have balconies that are fully exposed. So there is really precedence already established for both of those items. But I didn't mean to give you a menu, but I think you understand where we are coming from and we would like your direction so that we can move this project forward.

The last thing I'll say relates to one of the other conditions that wasn't discussed today, which is item #10. And this is just a personal preference on my part. I think actually I'm leaning towards replacing those, those metal panels are basically in the upper level of the garage as it faces Prince Street in the back, and we are, you can kind of see in the lower part of that rendering, and I'm leaning towards replacing those metal panels with windows because I think, that's what we did on Phase I and I think it is going to work really well on Phase I now that we have kind of walked

the building and seen how it looks and the light and the air that it brings into that parking garage. So I would just like, so there is no misunderstanding down the road, the flexibility to change the metal panels in that area to windows, and the windows would be consistent with the rest of the building. And I'm available for any questions you might have. And did I answer your question on Phase I sufficiently?

Chair Larsen: You did, I'll ask you an easy follow up on your last point. The, I would presume that as you replace, consider replacing some of the vertical panels, the larger vertical panels with windows that match the rhythm and projection, or the rhythm of the windows that you would likewise keep the louver, the vertical louvers, in place of your, repeating the rhythm of the upper stories? It looks as, on the rear elevation ...

Kelly Doran: Where there are louvers, you mean?

Chair Larsen: Yeah ...

Kelly Doran: Well, there are some mechanical louvers in that area, to service mechanical equipment in the garage and they do time out with the windows above it. It doesn't look like it on that rendering, but they actually do time out with the windows above it.

Chair Larsen: The first one on the ...

Kelly Doran: Can you go to that one?

Chair Larsen: It's in there somewhere. Oh, there you go. So you had the vertical louvers on the second, well, what is here the second, third, fourth ... and then you have the continuing vertical louver on the garage, the face of the garage. So I would presume you would replace the large panels with glass and

Kelly Doran: And the small ones with metal panels.

Chair Larsen: Keep the louvers so that it looks as though ...

Kelly Doran: So it is consistent. Yes. And then a few of those larger panels are, Mr. Chairman, a few of those larger panels, I can't remember exactly which ones, there is a couple of them that are actually louvers themselves for garage equipment and so on.

Chair Larsen: You guys didn't talk about illumination of the sign on the, kind of both signs, with the internal and external illumination. Does someone want to touch base on those?

Kelly Doran: Yes, Mr. Chair, the signs are a combination of internally lit letters and then what the staff called externally lit letters. What I would call a halo letter where the external of the letter is basically a metal ...

Chair Larsen: A reverse channel ...

Kelly Doran: Well, a reverse channel is another name for it, yes, in the sign business. So a reverse channel letter, a halo letter, it is basically a metal panel on stand offs, the lighting is behind it so that the letter is not opaque so the light glows around the south. It's not that kind of bright, RadioShack retail kind of sign.

Chair Larsen: Alright. I've got a couple of questions that occurred to me and then we'll, well, let's just see. Is that the extent of your presentation?

Kelly Doran: Yes.

Chair Larsen: Alright, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application, please step forward at this time. Anybody else? Ok, we'll close the public hearing and I'll just start with a couple questions. As I was looking on the plans, and I just want to make sure you guys have it right or I have it wrong, or you guys have it

wrong or whatever. But on page, on the plans, page A1.2 and page A1.3, the first floor plan and the second floor plan, and as I am looking at and as I look at your rendering here, and this rendering is fine to do that, but what I'm looking at, it looks like it calls for, and I guess maybe I'm looking, I was thinking they were balconies, but maybe they are just patios. It looked to sort of be that there was either a balcony or a patio on the, attached to the first and second floor units and obviously I'm not seeing that here so maybe I'm just reading that as, just by the hash marks and the crosshatching ...

Kelly Doran: No, there is no patios or balconies on the first floor units. There are some awning type structures that provide shelter. What you see in the rendering there, in kind of the middle of the page, is basically a 3-story lobby.

Chair Larsen: Nope, I'm sorry, on Envelope 4.

Kelly Doran: There are no balconies there. I think there is an overhang over the front entry doors to kind of create a shed look.

Aaron Roseth: Yes, that's a canopy, and so there is a stoop or a patio similar to Phase I that is along Main Street for those townhome units, and it is simply a canopy that is overhanging.

Chair Larsen: So that's what I'm seeing in both ...

Aaron Roseth: Commissioner Larsen, the graphic error in A1.2 is that should be a continuous canopy we have represented in both the elevation and the rendering before you.

Chair Larsen: Ok, that's a continuous canopy.

Aaron Roseth: I apologize for that.

Chair Larsen: And to that, is there the opportunity, you know we talked about the pediment, the two story pediment, is there an opportunity to continue the brick either down to the ground or down to the base, what might be more of a traditional warehouse style building where you will typically have the one and a half stories or the one and a mezzanine but yet still on some of the similar building materials, again to kind of create more of a reference.

Kelly Doran: Are you speaking on Envelope 4 now?

Chair Larsen: I am.

Kelly Doran: And so you are proposing that the plum colored brick come all the way to the gray ...

Chair Larsen: Yeah, more of a ...

Kelly Doran: We'd be ok with that.

Chair Larsen: The question, I mean, in terms of trying to create ...

Kelly Doran: A real separation of the whole façade? That would not be an issue.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any other questions? Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: I'm going to go back to that point 4 with the louvers again. I really appreciate what you've done with this plum colored façade, I like that expression, the big box. You know, it is a very strong, solid look that really is very warehouse-y. It fits in very well. What I struggle with a little bit, and maybe it is color, maybe it is just that ... the louver to me, it just doesn't fit that rhythm. And because it is expressed in a darker color and the balconies are expressed in a darker color, they stand out as just being kind of add ons to this building. And I keep wanting to come back and make this building just a solid corner anchor to the complex. And, Chad, your comment bringing the brick

expression to the ground to make this really just a solid corner expression is something I keep trying to get back to as well. So my question for you is the window expression, these large punch openings with glass infill, again, is very characteristic for this warehouse style. I look at the, your pair of doors in that louver and what I'm wondering is if there is a way of combining the louver into the overall door assembly so that it is an expression as a single opening similar to the way you've got your window openings as large punched openings. I'm wondering if that wouldn't in some way help unify, creating a single opening that would eliminate that kind of odd louver expression that is kind of an isolated element. And in doing that, you could widen those balconies to incorporate that space, which would also help hide a portion of that louver behind the balcony. I mean, it is just a suggestion, but it is something I keep coming back to. I love that expression, the horizontals with the punched openings, it is such a strong move and it is so different from everything else that you've got going here, I just want to keep going with it.

Chair Larsen: That's a nice idea.

Kelly Doran: Do you want me to answer that? Mr. Chair, the balconies are sized because the City of Minneapolis code limits the size of these balconies to 7x10 feet. We could certainly make them bigger, but that would require a variance from the Planning Commission

Chair Larsen: Like a Historic Variance?

Kelly Doran: Building code, I think, variance ... I'm not ...

Lackovic: that is 5x10 but yours is 4 x what?

Kelly Doran: I think they're 5x10, aren't they? They might be slightly smaller than that, but the maximum size you can go is 5x10 by the city code. The only issue that I think, that's an idea that, the only caveat I'd have to say is I'd have to have the structural engineer look at it in terms of how wide can that opening be without having some sort of structural member ... could that structural member then be enclosed in a metal that would match the louver? Perhaps, but it would make that metal feature wider, likely. Just so we are on the same page there, there is going to have to be some sort of structure there to support that window and I don't know, I'm not a structural engineer.

Lackovic: You don't have an opportunity to get a mullion in there and just (unclear) it would reduce the (unclear)

Aaron Roseth: Commissioner Lackovic, Chair Larsen, we, regarding that specific item, one of the challenges we had on Phase I, we finished entitlement and went into design development and construction documents, we ran into some very serious sharative issues with the exterior envelope of the building and we worked very, very closely with Aaron on every one of these details of what it meant. And we went as far as introducing the structural engineer and helping them explain also the impacts of this. We're taking wood frame construction and wanting it to be a concrete building. We can't afford a concrete building and we're pushing the envelope on many, many fronts. And so to Kelly's point, we could look at something like that. Our spans have to be such between the windows and the door openings and whatnot, that we can group these things in a way that we can get enough shear out of this exterior envelope by grouping the magic packs with some of those assemblies. Magic packs will give us no exterior shear value because you break it at that point, it has to be a continuous wall from floor to ceiling. So we can explore things like that, I think that what we are showing in the façade right now, in our opinion, blends it in as best we can knowing the rules that we learned through Phase I.

Chair Larsen: How, are the windows, the windows are just kind of piggy back on that, the door widths, kind of the double doors, I'm presuming that those aren't five feet each, so that can't be 10 feet across.

Kelly Doran: It may not be, I certainly think we could extend the balconies and make them wider to incorporate the louver into the balcony area. I do think that is, I don't know why that would be an issue. I do think there is enough room to do that.

Chair Larsen: I think Commissioner Lackovic's sort of point is the kind of combination of that along with the white expression, or whatever the window color is, matching that, starts to help.

Lackovic: I'm looking at this and you've got that little sliver of brick between the louver and the window and what I'm suggesting is, you know, you don't have to alter the construction here, necessarily, and make that a true opening, but you could eliminate that brick material, use the metal, widen the louver, infill that particular area with a material that is more consistent with the window frame, and louver, metal basically is what I guess I'm talking about.

Kelly Doran: Well, the other thing that we could do if you agreed with that is those louvers are shown as being an alternate color from the brick. The other thing is they could be painted to match the brick too, so there is a couple of different ways that you could do that and we would certainly be willing to explore, unless there was some code or structural issue that would prohibit us from expanding the size of those balconies we would certainly be willing to do that. I'd love to have a bigger balcony, so I don't have a problem with that. And we could certainly do something with the louvers to try to incorporate it into those balconies and/or paint them to blend them in with the brick rather than trying to contrast them, which is what is currently showing.

Chair Larsen: I would presume you would do that, Commissioner Lackovic, on the rear façade as well?

Kelly Doran: If we painted them, we would paint them all the way around.

Lackovic: The other louvers across the façade, the other ones you've got, I'm losing track of what the elevations are numbered, but the blond brick building where you've got the louvers incorporated, the thin strips, those don't bother me at all. I think those really do recess, the only ones I really think stand out as being kind of odd, and again because it detracts from the strength of that corner, the expression of the plum building, or the 15 louvers on the corner. The rest, I don't really, I think you've done a really nice job of blending them in and I don't think they stand out as being kind of a necessity, a louver necessity, whereas these really just kind of jump out at me. So whether they can be incorporated, if they can't for whatever reason, be incorporated into the expression of an opening, I think, painting them out so that they are, so that they disappear, would be probably the second option worth looking at.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Faucher.

Faucher: Ginny and I tend to think alike and we always are beating one another to the punch because I was thinking the exact same thing as far as grouping it. I guess my question then, back to you Ginny, a little bit, then would you see going more the same color with the window frames as well as the ... and the louvers, so it is all one ...

Lackovic: And the balcony.

Faucher: And is that a darker color and not the white?

Lackovic: I don't have an issue with the white. Again, the color to me with this particular building with the white bands to either side of the brick, kind of that dripstone band expression, the white didn't bother me at all. What I really don't like are the dark balconies with the white and the dark windows at the base courses with the white above. That got a little bit, way, just way too busy to me. But the upper stories with the white, I really actually think it helps strengthen the character of this building. So I didn't have a problem with the white, but it was the mixed colored metals on the first two floors and then the balconies and the louvers, then it kind of, that to me took away from that really clear expression for the windows.

Faucher: That kind of, I don't know, I not crazy about the white windows. I'm not dead set against it but I guess kind of looking to the building at the other end, there is still the white sills. They're not as horizontal. This corner is definitely much more horizontal and in some ways I think actually if you went with darker windows the white horizontal bands might be almost expressed more, it would stand out more. I don't know, maybe not, but yeah, I think ... and I don't really have a problem with the balconies projecting here. And maybe now I'm getting into too much discussion for amongst us, but yeah, mostly because that part is stepped back and if you look at the plans it looks like those balconies do not project any further forward than the front of the adjacent portion of the building that steps out. So, one other thing though, just to point out, is that if you do incorporate the louver into kind of the

door opening, that you carry through whatever that perceived width is. If it gets wider through to the windows that are below it, so you've still got that, you're not changing the overall width.

Chair Larsen: So lets ask if there are any specific questions. Commissioner Hunter, did you have a specific question?

Hunter Weir: No, mine was more comment. I do like the white windows particularly when you look at the one rendering where you see how they would be, the front, if you will, of the elevators. I mean it is, you have that just stunning white wall in the back and I think that the white window frames would actually look pretty nice as an introduction to that wall. So I'm partial to them.

Chair Larsen: Alright, why don't we go maybe through the sign. Let's talk about the sign and see how people feel about the sign.

Faucher: I'm sorry, is it the wall, the vertical wall sign ... or are we saying no to both of them under staff recommendation?

Chair Larsen: The wall sign, just the high one.

Faucher: So, Aaron, you're not referring to the sign up at the top at the cornice?

Chair Larsen: That's the wall sign, the other is a projecting sign. Is that correct?

Hanauer: That is correct.

Faucher: Oh, ok, I'm sorry. So the projecting ...

Chair Larsen: So you are ok with the projecting sign?

Hanauer: That is correct.

Chair Larsen: Even though it is above the guidelines?

Hanauer: Even though the sign is above the guidelines, yes.

Chair Larsen: Ok, and were you, just to follow up on that because it kind of cycles into the sign itself, the parapet. Because you were saying that the sign wasn't approved, is that why you didn't mention anything about the parapet?

Hanauer: Chair Larsen, the intention of the condition of approval was that the stories be true stories and that the parapet not be allowed. That was part of the recommendation.

Chair Larsen: Ok, that all stories be true stories.

Hanauer: Do you understand that as well, is that how you understood it? I mean I'm not questioning what I meant, I just didn't want to spring this on ...

Kelly Doran: Your position is that the sign goes away, the parapet goes away, is that what you said? That was our interpretation. We don't agree with that, but we understand that interpretation.

Chair Larsen: And so a question on that parapet, if we approve that sign the parapet appears to be a different material. Is that correct? It is like a metal panel, is there a reason that you chose a metal panel versus a continuation of the brick to make it look like it was actually a part of the same building? Who wants to tackle that question?

Kelly Doran: It was just an architectural design decision. You know, just some people like red, some people like blue. We just thought it looked better.

Chair Larsen: Ok. Alright, I'm sure we have some questions. Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: One question, it looks to me, and you have your aerial view of the roof and I guess I missed this at that point, but looking at your elevation it looks to me that the sign and the parapet structure that supports that sign actually is serving to screen some rooftop equipment that you have up there. Is that correct? This is the elevation that I'm looking at.

Kelly Doran: There will be some rooftop equipment on the roof that will be there to service the corridors, the lobby area, exercise area, that kind of thing will likely have, there will be some condensers up on the roof. Maybe a half a dozen, their exact location will be likely on a corridor path, depending on the final engineering of it.

Lackovic: Alright, so this does in a way help screen that too, to some extent?

Kelly Doran: If you are flying by,

Lackovic: From at least a front view it does.

Kelly Doran: Like our military people were the other day, they probably weren't interested in our rooftop mechanics.

Chair Larsen: I guess maybe I'll talk about the elephant in the room, about height.

Kelly Doran: Can I just add one comment about that parapet? Trace just reminded me ... Trace is the designing architect here. He said one of the things that we used for that parapet was to try to mimic the parapet that's at the A Mill. And I failed to mention that. So we can talk about it, but that was the reason behind it, it was to try to tie it back to the A Mill and some of the parapet that exists on top of the A Mill. It doesn't really show very well in this picture but that was why it was there.

Chair Larsen: You mean sort of the multi-stage ...

Kelly Doran: To mimic that.

Chair Larsen: Ok.

Kelly Doran: so I think there is really two decisions on the sign. I mean if you said you don't want the sign, obviously if you say you want the sign the parapet comes with it, but if you say you don't want the sign we could still build the parapet. In our mind, those don't have to be mutually exclusive.

Chair Larsen: My concern about the parapet was more kind of to Aaron's point. The fact that it should be not so much the true stories, however, and this kind of leads into one of my next questions or comments, you've designed it to look like a separate building just as you have the other phase and even in here. So by adding a parapet that's readable from the side as an add-on versus a true parapet where in an old style building you would have the sloping roof and would go almost a half story it seems that the extension or continuation, if you are going to make the parapet, in my mind it should be brick and it should extend back to a point of which, you know, really kind of the whole width of the expression of that building.

Faucher: I actually don't agree, just because there is two different kind of styles of building here, I think, we are looking at. You're thinking warehouse, but in the St. Anthony Falls district there is a lot of storefront buildings and to me this is more reminiscent of a storefront building that would have a different material at the cornice, very possibly a metal type cornice, and that might be where the name of the building is, or something like that. So it really doesn't bother me and I kind of like it that it is a little bit different.

Chair Larsen: In terms of materials and depth?

Faucher: Yes, and that it's not an actual true story, yeah.

Chair Larsen: And does this read as a storefront type building?

Faucher: You know, I don't know that it would if you are right in front of it as a pedestrian, but I think from across the river or from any of these views kind of across the street, it does read as kind of a stylized storefront building to me. I don't know if others, I mean the rest of it doesn't, but that particular piece does.

Chair Larsen: Alright, let's get some reaction on that, I saw Commissioner Mack put his button on.

R. Mack: Actually I had a different question, but it is related. And that is, on the roof plan, A 1.5, I don't understand that area where the parapet would be where the wall seems to jog in and out and yet the building itself runs straight across?

Kelly Doran: I've been waiting about 30 years for my architectural license from the state, so I'll let Trace answer.

Trace Jacques: Hi, I am Trace Jacques with ESG Architects. What you are seeing is a roof that covers those recessed balconies. The parapet runs straight across.

R. Mack: That's not the way it shows on your rendering.

Aaron Roseth: Commissioner Mack, that's the way it should be. We apologize. It's a section cut of the roof and so you are just below where that parapet would have been continued back. This is actually just below that roof, so it is giving the outline of the ...

Chair Larsen: Cutting through the window structure ...

Aaron Roseth: The same thing is true for these buildings.

R. Mack: Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Alright, so reaction to Commissioner Faucher's comment with reaction to mine ... who's right? Or were there any other opinions? Just teasing ... let's go to Commissioner Lindberg first.

Lindberg: I'm looking at the rendering. Well, to be honest, I'm just looking at the screen that we're all looking at on our monitors. The only reason I like the parapet is because it breaks up the height. Without that breakage I don't know if it would actually be that dramatic. So if it isn't that dramatic, then I don't find the need. But if it is that dramatic, then I liked at least the height variance.

Chair Larsen: And how do you feel about either material or depth of the return?

Lindberg: In regards to material, and again we are just looking at a rendering and it is never that true, so just saying from the rendering I like how you see the different, how you see the metal and it breaking up the colors. However, when I look at the metal in front of me, I'm not excited about it. Meaning the metal panel on the left. So, yeah, I mean looking at, I don't know. I guess I would rather see the brick continue up, to be honest, because looking at that rendering where I see the metal vertical panels, I'm not excited about that. So I guess I'd rather, I guess, just see the brick go up and have that projecting piece.

Chair Larsen: Alright, Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Hunter Weir: I don't know that I'm going to say anything terribly helpful here, but I had sort of assumed stone or brick for the parapet. I like the parapet a lot, because I think it breaks up that really big expanse of 7 story building. So I am very, very partial to it. I also spent a lot of time in western North Dakota so I'm kind of used to those fakeroo storefronts that have nothing behind them, so those bother me not at all. And I've been thinking about the sign, because it is a real problem. But then I was thinking about when is it a problem, and the answer to me seems mostly at night, right? I mean, as somebody who sits in the Guthrie a lot and looks out across the river, you have this interesting combination of the Stone Arch Bridge and 35. So you have this very old and this very new structure that is differentiated by light and, to me, is stunning beautiful. So I don't know if there is something to be done along those lines. I don't think, at first when I saw the sign I thought uhhhh, I think that was in the M&M phase, and I was like, no, not going there. But I can sort of see the advantage of having a lighted sign from across the river. It just has to be really, really well done and Mill & Main, whatever, whether it needs to be that particular size or not is another issue. But I don't think even a lighted sign bothers me all that much on the top of the parapet.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: I'm going to sound like I'm not much fun at all today, but I keep going back to simplicity and I really like this building as an 8 story building. I think that is kind of coming across as a general ...

Chair Larsen: This particular facade.

Lackovic: This particular façade.

Faucher: Seven.

Lackovic: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven ... it is seven right now, the parapet is kind of a not-story, so to go with the city's, CPED's interpretation of that being a full story, making that a full story, looking at this as an eight story building I think is a nice break in that, the rhythm here. What I struggle with, again, as I often do, is the change in materials. I don't see a reason to change the materials. I would love to see that common expression go all the way up as a full story. How that full story returns I guess is open to discussion. You know, the partial return walls look a little funny to me. Again, it looks added, it looks like a short cut. It looks, what did you just call it?

Hunter Weir: Fakeroo storefront?

Lackovic: And so, again, whether to save cost, whether that actually tapered down as a lot of historic buildings do, if those walls tapered back from a full height to a more modest parapet height, that might be something worth considering. But I really think that having that as a similar expression in materials simplifying it so it doesn't have, I'm not sure what's going on with the overhanging, I'm not sure what those actually do, I guess for me having that as a simple brick upper story with the sign, a lit sign, would be a beautiful expression. I'm not opposed to the lit sign as long as its not neon. Because I think that the neon would then start to compete with the Pillsbury sign and some of the other historic signs that are really, you know all the historic signs tend to be that neon style and I think this should not be that. But as a backlit sign, a well done backlit sign on a very simple backdrop, I think that actually would be a nice expression. Again, it gets to be a little much when it gets to be a different material and it has overhanging things and the sign and light, and then it becomes almost too much attention to it. So I think a subtle expression with some subtle lighting would be actually really nice.

Chair Larsen: Looks like there is sort of some differing expressions of the sort of parapet as it returns and the cornice cap as it returns around on that envelope 3. I can't tell on this rendering, it looks as though it is sort of, the one that's on the screen now, it looks as though there is a sort of cap and then the parapet comes up off of that and that parapet kind of, or cornice cap, kind of wraps around the side and, in which case, you can have a, is that the vertical aluminum panels and is that a cornice cap or is that a parapet?

Kelly Doran: Both.

Chair Larsen: Both, ok. Ginny, would you put ... Commissioner Lackovic, would you put the, express the brick above that kind of cornice/parapet, like a stone ...

Lackovic: I probably would reduce the height of that. I mean having a vertical, I mean having a horizontal band, a dripstone band or a washband is, you know, you've got it in the building in the foreground has that expression and I think it is very successful there, and I love that cap to that building because it does recall more of that traditional cornice/parapet without imitating a traditional cornice and parapet. I think on the blond building something similar to that could be effective. I guess I would go with a more traditional expression without being traditional. I mean I like what happens on ... what am I talking about really ...

Chair Larsen: Maybe we could just sort of let them figure it out.

Lackovic: But I like that recalling the parapet on the cornice is a really strong move. I don't know that it is successful the way it is handled currently in the blond building. I think it is confused.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Mack.

R. Mack: I'm relatively new to the commission and so I'm not exactly sure of which things are acceptable and which things aren't.

Chair Larsen: I'll tell you.

R. Mack: I may confuse things further, but it seems to me that there are a number of these conditions that are being suggested that really affect a go/no go decision. And it is my understanding that what you really need is to be able to make that decision so you can negotiate with Dominium as far as property lines and so forth. And so it seems to me that the go/no go things would be the projecting balconies, the extra story or lack of story at the ends, and some of those things. I think that from what I hear, the parapet, if they work on that a bit more into the future, that's fine. If it is white or bronze colored windows or bright blue or whatever, that really doesn't affect the go/no go decision. And so would it be appropriate for us to make decisions on the go/no go things and then say but please come back as you are getting closer to actually going into construction to address these things that are less significant.

Chair Larsen: Is that a question?

R. Mack: That's a question, is it acceptable. Well, is it acceptable by our procedures and is it acceptable to them?

Kelly Doran: Do you want me to answer that?

Chair Larsen: You can if you want to, you don't have to.

Kelly Doran: No, I'd be happy to, Mr. Chair and Commissioner Mack. I think you are somewhat spot on, I would just add a couple things. I think the other critical ingredient is the magic pack issue. I think that needs to be addressed and the only caveat, and I don't have any problem coming back with some further thoughts on some of those things, and that's ok, but I do want to request that we be allowed to also go to the Planning Commission and move that ball forward and, you know, if we can get back on schedules and ... I don't know what all the meeting dates are and so if we end up in front of Planning Commission and we still want to come back and talk about the color of windows, that's fine. But I want to get past the land use part of it as well, so that I know, because Planning Commission has to approve a CUP to allow this height. If they say no to the height, then I'm kind of back to point zero. So I have to get to there to get some of those bigger issues flushed out as well. And so as long as you were ok with that part of it, then I would be ok with the direction that you are taking.

Chair Larsen: And so to that point, just as Mr. Hanauer has indicated, the wall sign is not approved or the other things that are not approved. That means that those elements need to be reflected back to us and so likewise we can say the sign is approved but the parapet is not, or so we can condition the things that we don't need to design but we've provided some guidance on as options.

R. Mack: Also, a little bit of a tangent, but I would really like to thank you for the renderings. Even those of us who are used to looking at elevations every day, and floor plans every day, they really helped explain it much, much better.

Kelly Doran: And if I could just add to that real quickly, Commissioner Mack and Chair Larsen, you know, I would like to have some direction from you to come back, as I think it will influence some of these other decisions. You know, if you could just say, hey, yay to the sign, no to the sign, yay to the parapet, no to the parapet, yay to the parapet but bring it back, give me some direction so that we can work towards that and work with staff as well towards bringing that back to you at a later date.

Chair Larsen: Alright, I want to address height. And you know one of the things that, I was here when we looked at the initial Schaffer Richardson proposal and approved it, I was one of those that voted in favor of the sort of high rise and mid rise buildings and one of the concerns that I've had all along as we look along this riverfront is the importance of the sort of diversity of heights, building materials, facades and step backs and the rhythm of projections. And I think that the applicant and architect have done a very nice job with materials, rhythm of projections, and you know my very strong concern is on height. And I think as we looked at Phase I, it's distance from the A Mill complex was, and its adjacency to some of the apartment buildings that are further to the east, you know they did a nice job in creating those rhythm of projections, making the buildings feel like they were sort of whole individual units tied as a group. And one of the things I've sort of noticed in this particular proposal, well, and then at that point, though, however, I think we made it pretty clear that the second phase, when that came forward, should really not look like the first phase. That it should have a different character and have some changes in height to reflect the changes in variation of height of the A Mill complex and provide some kind of, I don't want to say step down, because that's not quite right, but at the same time to keep it from looking not like a long block. And as the applicant, Mr. Doran, has indicated, I think they have done a successful job as you look at the elevations or the perspectives that they've presented from the street. That you look at it, it looks like there is, there is rhythm of projections, there is some changes in materials, and so as you are walking down the street I think that you will feel that these are somewhat different buildings and I would agree that the Prince Street, being able to look back up at the Red Tile elevator and having things stepped back like that is a key, it is a nice component. However, the fact that there is some foliage and growth in the front and in the park in front, or along the park edge, and the fact that this is next to the landmark and larger context of the park district, National Park Service district, as you look back from both sides of the river you do get a rhythm of projections in terms of rooftops and materials and elevations and so you know when you are at the Guthrie or on the Stone Arch or any kind of anywhere in the heart of downtown and you are looking across, you will see above the trees and you will see these buildings rise above the trees. And what, if constructed as proposed, you will see a single line running all the way across, I don't know how many football fields it is, but it is a lot. And that's not really represented anywhere else in the character or kind of along the riverfront. And so I mean these are super duper prime development pieces. Our marketplace at the moment is leaning to apartment buildings and sometime when developers have built apartments till the cows come home and they can't get financing on them anymore because the apartment rates are crashing, they will switch around and they'll start building condos and they will have wished they built large high rise concrete buildings. I kind of wish that too, but I think that my strong concern is that if there is no change in elevation, and I, we're going to look back on this a long time from now, or not even too far ahead, and sort of wonder, what happened, what opportunity was missed. And I respect the developer's and the architect's comments about the maximum of the structure type and what is available, but at the same time I gotta look and say hey, wait a minute here, what are we doing. This is sort of larger than just, gee, we need to build apartments right now, this is what's affordable. This is the most prime development spot in the Minneapolis riverfront for many years to come and so while I don't want to see a site lie fallow, I don't think that's necessary or appropriate, at the same time I think that you, I look at this and I think gosh, what can we do to ameliorate the conditions that are presented before us. The challenges that the developer has in terms of what they can build as well as what we can do to provide guidance. And so I think that the envelope 4, envelope 1, I'm not, I have a couple ideas but at the same time I sort of feel like I'm not sure it is my job to exactly say I've got some ideas but I feel like there needs to be some elevation change and that needs to be readable from the, from across the river or in elevation likeness. As I think a couple commissioners have pointed out, they look at the parapet where the sign is and they think, ahh, thank god, there is something that sticks up because really, this is the way you are going to read it from across the river. So the sign helps to draw some attention to that elevation

change and I think there needs to be some elevation change. And I don't like to say that, that's not ... but at the same time that was something that we had indicated loud and clear in the initial business meeting. It was indicated loud and clear in the business meeting so I was hopeful that as we came back to this, the application, that we would see something different. So I was disappointed when I opened my packet, like great, we're going to see some elevation change, and none. And so, I think to me that's the real big sticking point. So I don't know what the opportunities are (gap due to tape change) I think in terms of, I think there are opportunities to create some additional exceptional spaces. Potentially by, as the staff recommended, by reducing the height of envelope 1 and envelope 4 where you might be able to have some rooftop decks and some increased views for other units that would make those more marketable and increase the rent opportunities. With larger patios and decks for adjacent units and so I think there are some opportunities there. I think that, by maybe even bringing the red brick down to the ground on envelope 4 to help create that as more of a solid mass and an individual building, by stepping down a story and some, I would love to see two story step downs, but I think that is kind of pushing it. But I think that whether it is the sides, front, middle, somewhere needs to step down so there is a feeling of a rhythm of projections. And so, I'll open it up to thoughts on that. Sorry for the long diatribe. Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Hunter Weir: Yeah, I was one of those too who I think had some very serious concerns with Phase I and I'm looking at why didn't it catch my eye as much this time around and I think the answer is on A.01 where Phase II is again in front of the white elevators. And so everything there looks fine to me, where I start running into problems is to the right of that where there is nothing behind it. And rather than stepping it down and being neither an engineer or architect, nor somebody who has to worry about money, I would like to see it taller on the east end. Something that gives it a bump higher, that kind of speaks back to what is happening over on the western side of the development. But I think that that is it. I think it didn't strike me as obviously this time around because of the white elevators providing some depth, some height, in the background. But I think it needs a little bit more height. You know, taking off one floor might do the trick, but somehow, high seemed better to me.

Chair Larsen: You know, I wouldn't disagree with that. And in fact, actually, one of the things that sort of just came to mind as Commissioner Lackovic was drawing, I almost sort of wonder do you put Mill & Main on that corner, on the corner of Mill & Main. You know, do you raise the parapet of ... (unclear) ... yeah, I know, but at the same time you put it on the corner of Mill & Main and you have two sets. One facing east

Faucher: Except that where it is right now, it is kind of the main entry and it is sort of accentuating that.

Chair Larsen: Yeah, sure, but it would still be a parapet. You have a projecting sign in front of it so nobody's, you are really, as you are looking across the river you are trying, you are making a call. And then it actually helps to tie both Phase I and Phase II together. And by extending a high parapet ... yes, Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg: Oh, I was just saying honestly I think we should keep the middle parapet where it is and if we need height variation, again, I'm not a structural engineer, but if you added an eighth story on to that eastern end of that building and wrap it around the side to get (unclear)

Chair Larsen: You're still talking about building 3, envelope 3?

Lindberg: I believe it would be envelope 1.

Chair Larsen: ok, so envelope 1, wrap the front and side.

Lindberg: (unclear)

Faucher: I think though, the problem, and they can correct, no, no, no, from a code standpoint, I think you are only allowed two floors of cast in place concrete and then five stories of stick framed wood framing above that. And so they can't go higher. Is that correct?

Chair Larsen: And/or what is the parapet height restrictions?

Faucher: That, there isn't, I don't think ...

Chair Larsen: right, and I think that's what she's sort of creating, the parapet ...

Faucher: Oh, oh, you're not saying have another story ...

Chair Larsen: Not an additional story of livable space ...

Faucher: Not another story of liveable space, got it. Ok, sorry.

Lindberg: (unclear)

Chair Larsen: Comments? Commissioner Mack.

R. Mack: In looking at A3.1, I think that the uniformity of the height is reinforced by the fact that all the windows are the same height. And so those horizontal bands between the windows are all the same height and so if there were a way to use window sill heights, window head heights with some variation from building to building then that would in turn start to break up the sense of height as well.

Chair Larsen: Yeah, right, more floor to ceiling windows on the warehouse or one of the two, something. It looks, in some ways it actually looks like they are kind of ... it is hard to tell by the picture. So to my comments about height, are there, do you feel, commissioners, do you feel that sort of by adding height at the parapet, is there a concern, do you guys have a concern, or would you concur but yet feel that additional height in places can help to ameliorate that concern? Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: I don't know that changing parapet, adding to parapet height is going to be enough. I think you know if you are going to do this I think you do a full story as Commission Faucher points out is difficult with this construction type. So basically you are asking them to change construction type at that point. I still think that little blond building would be dynamite with another story or two on top of what is there right now. It really does help, for me, break up that phase, break up Phase II and I think as Mr. Doran, as you've pointed out, I mean if you look at it just flat elevation, it is a little misleading because these buildings do project and recess that will help alter your perspective of that height. It is still a long stretch and I keep wanting to add another couple stories to Phase I on the corner to help modulate that a little bit. But I think you know that realistically without changing the construction type, I think it is difficult. I mean adding another foot or two to a parapet height isn't going to change anything. Going up in height, unless you are changing the construction type is difficult. Taking off a story then, we run into other issues for feasibility and an economic standpoint. I don't think we can design their project for them in that way. So I think we can suggest if there is a way of adding height to one of the smaller footprints if you can get another story of two out of that by changing a construction type there, if that's possible maybe that is something worth looking at. But I think to start suggesting adding or taking out complete floors across the whole thing is being a little bit much. I agree with your point though, that it is a long bar, but it is a long bar out of ...

Chair Larsen: The, I would agree to say remove a story is, and remove a story here and there, isn't necessarily the appropriate solution. But at the same time I certainly think it is certainly within our purview and responsibility to protect this site and view shed and so whether or not it is adding or removing or subtracting, pushing back, whatever it takes, that's really architects and those professionals to decide. But it is certainly within our purview to say that a single uniform height building is not appropriate considering the context that it now sits within, which is a uniform height building to its south and a multi height complex to its north – or east and west I guess. So I guess that's really more to the question. Commissioner Mack.

R. Mack: For purposes just of discussion, I would like to make a tentative motion and then it can get amended as people please. I would move to adopt the staff findings and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction at 501 Main Street SE with the following conditions. I keep condition number one as it is, I'd keep condition number 2 as it is. I'd keep number 3 as it is, delete number 4 in its entirety, number 5 the applicant will study and will return at a later date, number 6 delete in its entirety...

Chair Larsen: I'm sorry, so 3 delete ...

R. Mack: Keep 3. Delete 4, in other words we would accept the louvers. Number 5 with the signs that they would study and come back with those at another date. Number 6 the balconies, delete, in other words accept them as they are. Number 7, the windows, the applicant will study and return at a later date, Number 8 keep as it is. Number 9, the sticky one, I would say delete, in other words accept the heights at both ends but return with options to create an appearance of variation. And then number 10 would be kept.

Chair Larsen: Ok, does that bear repeating in order for a second?

Hunter Weir: I'll second.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Hunter Weir, thank you. Alright, so discussion on the motion. Did you want to preface the discussion with any other comments other than what you said?

R. Mack: No, I think that they speak for themselves. I did a little bit of editorializing on the way.

Chair Larsen: Ok, I don't know who was first, Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg: My concerns with those louvers as they appear in the renderings with the dark metal and with that, I'm not comfortable with that, so I guess I would ask that the louvers return, be studied and return at a later date too.

Chair Larsen: Might I suggest a friendly amendment that item number 4 be retained to read "exposed HVAC louvers are allowed on the outside walls with the envelope 4 facing Main Street SE and elevation facing the A Mill building to have matching, louvers matching the window color."

Lindberg: I'd kind of like to see the study and come back, to be honest, because I liked Ginny's suggestions and I know we're not designing buildings so it is probably poor precedent.

Chair Larsen: Well, it gives them the opportunity to change the color if they want. I suppose they can come back and say they want bronze or they want white. So, are not approved.

Lindberg: I'd study and come back at a later date.

Chair Larsen: Well, you know the study and come back is really, and Commissioner Hanauer, or Mr. Hanauer, maybe can clarify but if I'm not mistaken, the study and come back is really saying not approved. So if you say not approved, they have to study and come back. Ms. Dvorak.

Dvorak: Commissioners, the other option that you would have this evening is to provide feedback to the applicant, continue the item, don't take an actual approval or denial of the item. Continue the item to a future date of the commission and have them go back and do the study now. We won't be able to approve any building permits without these details being worked out anyway. So they're not holding up a building permit, you're not holding up a building permit application without these details being worked out, and these details need to be worked out before Planning Commission can review it anyway. So it seems that, I heard study and come back three or four times and now we're maybe adding a fifth one, and this is over half of the conditions, that that might be the best option is to just continue this, let the applicants and their architectural team go back, not to the drawing board completely, but go back and then come back in a month or two months or however long, we can ask them what they think they would need to study these different items and then come back. That also is less work administratively for staff, to be honest, than to start all over on a new application.

Chair Larsen: Right, because right, in that sense if you deny these elements and they are coming back with a new application, or even with approving with some changes, if they come back it is a new staff report.

Dvorak: That is correct.

R. Mack: What effect would that have on negotiations with Dominium?

Chair Larsen: And/or (?)

Kelly Doran: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Mack, it will delay it. We will have to have some closure on some of these issues so we know what we can build and I don't know, I can't sit here today and tell you Dominium's exact schedule, but whether or not we come back in another month, I don't know that that's a killer by any means but it will delay some of that process. But they have other, sounds like they have other issues ...

Chair Larsen: Everybody's got issues ...

Kelly Doran: Yeah, so Ms. Dvorak's point is well taken but I do think it would be, even if you elect to do that, it would be helpful for us in our discussions with staff then to at least give us some direction. No sign, yes sign. No exposed balconies, no ... whatever, if you just give us some direction so we can take some of these issues off the table and focus on what you are really looking to address in a subsequent meeting, that would be very helpful.

Chair Larsen: Ok, thank you. Alright, so how do you feel about that?

R. Mack: I will withdraw my motion.

Chair Larsen: Ok, is that acceptable to the seconder?

Hunter Weir: Yes indeed.

Chair Larsen: Alright, so with that we can go through ... well, let's look at in general, is there a consensus that the items that were proposed for future study, that those are indeed the items that the commission feels are important? I'm see nods. And so let's do this, let's kind of run through each of those items starting with item number 4, the exposed HVAC louvers, to provide the applicant some suggestion/direction as to what it is we are looking for in a future study. And I think I'll defer to Commissioner Mack who, well I suppose he was kind of ok with them, so do you want to respond?

R. Mack: I think that the exposed louvers, as long as they are architecturally integrated with the entire façade, would be completely acceptable.

Chair Larsen: In their current state, they are not because of the ...

R. Mack: And I won't tell you how to integrate them.

Chair Larsen: Right, but you feel that they are not integrated due to the color, material, and rhythm change?

R. Mack: Correct.

Faucher: Only on that one portion though.

Chair Larsen: We're talking about the Main Street and the rear.

Faucher: Otherwise the western (unclear)

Chair Larsen: The corner, the north ... or the south and west. And would others kind of concur with that, that we've given them some ideas in terms of color matching and you guys can address that ... ok. Item number 5, the Mill & Main wall sign. Correct me if I am wrong, but it seems as though we are fine with the wall sign and it could be as it relates to height throughout the building, it could be on this parapet, it could be on another parapet, maybe

on another elevation as well, but that we'd like to see some kind of better integration of the parapet with the building envelope so that it reads as an integrated element and likely with similar material, but depending on how that design evolves, that's up to you. Does that seem correct? I'm seeing nods, ok. Item number 6, the balconies, we are saying that that is ok to have the projecting balconies on that front façade of envelope 4.

R. Mack: I have a quick question regarding that. On the first rendering, it includes a piece to the Pillsbury A Mill complex. It looks like there, there are or will be projecting balconies and since I had to recuse myself from that conversation, will there be projecting balconies on that building?

Kelly Doran: Is this the rendering you were talking to?

Chair Larsen: No, the night one.

Kelly Doran: The night one with snow?

Chair Larsen: That one. The projecting balconies on the ...

Kelly Doran: Oh, that is a renderer's ... he's waiting for his license too. That doesn't belong, we're not proposing that, so.

Chair Larsen: Ok, so there are no projecting balconies on... ok, and so that might be corrected on the future things.

R. Mack: But there are projecting balconies across the river at the Whitney.

Chair Larsen: Um, that was approved on appeal by the city council to the HPC recommendation, to be noted. So, ok, item number 7, we are asking them to study that so we are saying that the white or bronze depends on the integration of the louvers? Or ...

Lackovic: It should be uniform throughout the building.

Chair Larsen: Uniform throughout that building's expression, envelope 4's expression, and that could include then the other materials of the envelope 4.

Kelly Doran: I'm sorry, we were chatting there for a second. Could you just repeat that?

Chair Larsen: Yup, so we are talking about item number 7, window frames should be dark browns or black, white window frames are not allowed. Ok, so we're not, we're saying that white could be ok, so could dark, but that the multi-color expression to the main two floor with the upper floors should likely be uniform and have a better expression that might also alter then the building materials as it goes down to the floor, or down to the street. Ok, is that correct? Does that match everybody's ... ok, then, so item number 8, the true divided lights, we've kind of had that discussion. And 9, the height, so that the height variation, they can look at options for height variation to the greatest extent allowed by law, so to speak.

Faucher: Creating an appearance more than (unclear)

Chair Larsen: It has to be convincing, they have to be convincing I think is sort of the biggest thing that we can say. You gotta do, it's a huge piece. And that cannot be overlooked. So, ok.

Kelly Doran: Can I just ask one point of clarification, Mr. Chair? We didn't really address it in any of the discussion but I'm assuming no one is going to object on item 10 if we replace those metal panels with windows. I'm assuming that that ... it will show up in the next generation and I just want to make sure we are on the same page.

Chair Larsen: Yeah, I think that ... yup, I like the idea of the windows and the continuation. Yup, I think that's a great idea. Ok, so, with that, is there a motion to, oh, I will ask how many cycles or how much time would you like? One cycle. Ok. One cycle would be, well it would be two cycles, there is no way to do it in one because ...

Kelly Doran: You meet monthly?

Chair Larsen: We meet bi-monthly however we've already published next meetings. So, yup, Ms. Dvorak.

Dvorak: Commissioners, we won't need to renotice if you continue this, so they could go to the October 24 meeting, however our staff reports have already been completed for that and I would just note that in October we only have one meeting, and that is October 23.

Faucher: You mean September?

Dvorak: Oh, no it is October next month.

Hunter Weir. The first time though I think you said October 24th and you meant ...

Chair Larsen: No, sorry, next meeting is on September ...

Dvorak: 24th, I'm sorry.

(unclear)

Chair Larsen: So October 23rd would be the second meeting from now.

(unclear)

Kelly Doran: October 23rd is fine, Mr. Chair. Do you need me to talk into the microphone?

Chair Larsen: No, you don't, that's fine. Alright, so October 23 is fine with the applicant, ok, so is there a motion to continue? Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg: I make a motion that we continue this for two cycles.

Lackovic: I'll second.

Chair Larsen: Did we get that right, Ms. Dvorak? Alright, so anyway I just want to make sure we do everything right around here. Ok, so, we have a second, is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll call the roll.